A criterion for testing multi-particle NPT entanglement

B. Zeng[1], D. L. Zhou[2], P. Zhang[3], Z. Xu[1,2], and L. You[3,4]
[1] *Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China*
[2] *Center for Advanced Study, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China*
[3] *Institute of Theoretical Physics, The Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100080, China and*
[4] *School of Physics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332, USA*
(Dated: February 1, 2008)

We revisit the criterion of multi-particle entanglement based on the overlaps of a given quantum state ρ with maximally entangled states. For a system of m particles, each with N distinct states, we prove that ρ is m-particle negative partial transpose (NPT) entangled, if there exists a maximally entangled state $|\mathrm{MES}\rangle$, such that $\langle\mathrm{MES}|\rho|\mathrm{MES}\rangle > 1/N$. While this sufficiency condition is weaker than the Peres-Horodecki criterion in all cases, it applies to multi-particle systems, and becomes especially useful when the number of particles (m) is large. We also consider the converse of this criterion and illustrate its invalidity with counter examples.

arXiv:quant-ph/0305091v1 16 May 2003

Quantum entanglement is among the most intriguing properties of a composite quantum system. It usually refers to any inseparable correlations that are stronger than those allowed by classical physics. In recent years, it has become increasingly clear that *entanglement* is not only of interest to the understanding of a proper interpretation of the foundations of quantum mechanics, it also represents a useful resource for quantum information processing and quantum computation [1].

Despite its importance, much remains to be learned about the mathematical characterization of multi-particle entanglement. For a m-particle pure state $|\psi\rangle$, it is well-known that the necessary and sufficient condition for it to be m-particle entangled, i.e. when $|\psi\rangle$ does not take the form of $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle$, where $|\psi_1\rangle$ is a k-particle state ($1 \leq k \leq m-1$) and $|\psi_2\rangle$ is a state of the other $m-k$ particles, is that all $1 - \mathrm{tr}(\rho_k^2) \neq 0$, where ρ_k the reduced density matrix (of state $|\psi\rangle$) for any k-particles. In practice, this criterion for multi-particle entanglement is difficult to apply, especially when m is large as the task of verification increases exponentially with m. The case of mixed states is more difficult, even for bi-particle systems [2]. Instead of *entanglement*, inseparability is often used for non-local quantum correlations of a mixed state ρ.

For bi-particle mixed states, it is well-known that the Peres-Horodecki criterion is arguably the most useful sufficient condition for quantum entanglement. It is also a necessary condition for systems of reduced dimensions $2 \otimes 2$ and $2 \otimes 3$ [3, 4]. However for higher dimensional cases it fails to be a neessary one since there exists a large number of positive partial transpose (PPT) states [5, 6]. Recently, it has been successfully generalized to the special case of continuous variables [7, 8]. Unfortunately, even to test NPT entanglement, applying this criterion to a multi-particle system meets the same computational challenge as in the pure state case.

Another useful concept of mixed state quantum correlation is *distillability*, which measures the amount of pure state entanglement 'distillable' from a mixed state [9]. Intuitively, one expects that if the overlap of a state ρ with a maximally entangled state (MES) (sometimes also called m-GHZ state [10]) is sufficiently high, then the state ρ must become distillable. These type of questions were first considered by Bennett *et al.* [11]. They introduced the notion of a fully entangled fraction, or fidelity, to deal with the relationship between entanglement of formation and entanglement distillation. A necessary and sufficient condition for a two qubit state ρ to be distillable was later found to be that the state ρ is distillable if and only if its fidelity is greater than $1/2$ [12]. This result was subsequently generalized to the case of higher dimensional bi-particle states by Horodeckis and a sufficient condition for N-dimensional bi-particle NPT entanglement is obtained [2, 13]. Conveniently stated, the result of Horodeckis becomes: if the fidelity of ρ is greater than $1/N$ then the state of ρ is NPT entangled.

In this paper we revisit a sufficient condition for m-particle entanglement of a state ρ based on its overlaps with maximally entangled states. For a system of m qubits, this sufficiency condition first appeared in Ref. [14], and was also discussed previously in Refs. [15, 16]. Surprisingly, we find the Horodeckis' result is valid for systems involving $m > 2$ parties and the proof is fairly simple. This naturally leads to the formulation of a new multi-particle NPT entanglement criterion, which is relatively easy to apply, and thus seems particularly useful when m is large. Before we present a proof for the new criterion, we first prove the following lemma, which gives a simple criterion for testing multi-particle entanglement.

Lamma For an arbitrary N-state m-particle separable state ρ, i.e. ρ can be written as $\sum_i p_i \rho_1^{(i)} \otimes \rho_2^{(i)}$ (where $\rho_1^{(i)}$ is a k-particle state ($1 \leq k \leq m-1$) and $\rho_2^{(i)}$ is the state of the other $m-k$ particles, $p_i > 0$ and $\sum_i p_i = 1$), then $\langle\mathrm{MES}|\rho|\mathrm{MES}\rangle \leq 1/N$ for any MES.

Proof: We first prove the pure state case, i.e. let $|\psi\rangle$ be a m-particle (each with N-state) pure state, if $|\psi\rangle$ can be written as $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle$ (where $|\psi_1\rangle$ is a k-particle state ($1 \leq k \leq m-1$) and $|\psi_2\rangle$ is the state of the other $m-k$ particles), then $|\langle\mathrm{MES}|\psi\rangle|^2 \leq 1/N$ for any MES.

We note that any N-state m-particle MES can be written as $|\mathrm{MES}\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{N} |\underbrace{ii\cdots i}_{m}\rangle/\sqrt{N}$ in a properly chosen basis. Let $a_i = \langle\underbrace{ii\cdots i}_{k}|\psi_1\rangle$ and $b_i = \langle\underbrace{ii\cdots i}_{m-k}|\psi_2\rangle$, then

we have $\sum_i |a_i|^2 \leq 1$, $\sum_i |b_i|^2 \leq 1$, and

$$|\langle \text{MES}|\psi\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{N}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i b_i\right|^2 \leq \frac{1}{N}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}|a_i b_i|\right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{N}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{|a_i|^2+|b_i|^2}{2}\right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{N}. \quad (1)$$

The equality $|\langle \text{MES}|\psi\rangle|^2 = 1/N$ holds iff

$$\begin{aligned} |a_i| &= |b_i|, \\ \arg(a_i b_i) &= \text{const.}, \\ \sum_{i=1}^{N}|a_i|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{N}|b_i|^2 = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where arg(.) refers to the argument of the complex number variable.

Give a mixed state $\rho = \sum_i p_i \rho_1^{(i)} \otimes \rho_2^{(i)}$, we can rewrite $\rho_1^{(i)}$ and $\rho_2^{(i)}$ in their diagonal representation, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \sum_i p_i \left(\sum_j q_j |\psi_1^{(i)}\rangle_{jj}\langle\psi_1^{(i)}|\right) \otimes \left(\sum_l r_l |\psi_2^{(i)}\rangle_{ll}\langle\psi_2^{(i)}|\right) \\ &= \sum_{i,j,l} p_i q_j r_l \left(|\psi_1^{(i)}\rangle_j \otimes |\psi_2^{(i)}\rangle_l {}_j\langle\psi_1^{(i)}| \otimes {}_l\langle\psi_2^{(i)}|\right), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\sum_j q_j = 1$ and $\sum_l r_l = 1$. Using the result of Eq. (1) for a pure state, we get

$$\langle \text{MES}|\rho|\text{MES}\rangle \leq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i,j,l} p_i q_j r_l = \frac{1}{N}. \quad (4)$$

This proof naturally leads to the following criterion for multi-particle entanglement: for any state ρ of a N-state m-particle system, if there exists a maximally entangled state $|\text{MES}\rangle$, such that $\langle \text{MES}|\rho|\text{MES}\rangle > 1/N$, then ρ is m-particle entangled. This generalizes a similar criterion for the case of many qubits discussed before in Refs. [14, 15, 16]

The main result of this paper is to prove that the above criterion is a criterion for multi-particle NPT entanglement, i.e.

Theorem (The MES criterion) For any state ρ of a N-state m-particle system, if there exists a maximally entangled state $|\text{MES}\rangle$, such that $\langle \text{MES}|\rho|\text{MES}\rangle > 1/N$, then ρ is m-particle NPT entangled, i. e. ρ^{T_B} is no longer positive for partial transpose of any k-particle subsystems, where $(1 \leq k \leq m-1)$.

Proof: We prove the negative inverse proposition of the criterion, i. e. for any state ρ of a N-state m-particle system, if there is a partial transpose operator T_B acting on any of its k-particle subsystem, where $(1 \leq k \leq m-1)$, s.t. $\rho^{T_B} \geq 0$, then $|\langle \text{MES}|\psi\rangle|^2 \leq 1/N$ for any MES.

To prove this, we first write an arbitrary MES as $|\text{MES}\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{N} |\underbrace{ii\cdots i}_{m}\rangle/\sqrt{N}$ in a properly chosen basis. Let $P_+ = |\text{MES}\rangle\langle\text{MES}|$, i. e. a projection operator onto this multi-particle maximally entangled state. For a given partial transpose on any k-particle subsystem, we define a map

$$\begin{aligned} |\underbrace{ii\cdots i}_{k}\rangle &\longrightarrow |i\rangle_A, \\ |\underbrace{ii\cdots i}_{m-k}\rangle &\longrightarrow |i\rangle_B, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

general states in the two subspaces

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_\alpha\rangle_A &= \sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i |i\rangle_A, \\ |\psi_\beta\rangle_B &= \sum_{i=1}^{N}\beta_i |i\rangle_B, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

and a flip operator $V = \sum_{ij} |i\rangle_{AA}\langle j| \otimes |j\rangle_{BB}\langle i|$, such that

$$V|\psi_\alpha\rangle_A \otimes |\psi_\beta\rangle_B = |\psi_\beta\rangle_A \otimes |\psi_\alpha\rangle_B. \quad (7)$$

It is then easy to show that

$$P_+^{T_B} = \frac{1}{N}V, \quad (8)$$

which leads to

$$\text{tr}(\rho P_+) = \text{tr}(\rho^{T_B} P_+^{T_B}) = \frac{1}{N}\text{tr}(\rho^{T_B} V). \quad (9)$$

Since ρ is PPT under T_B, ρ^{T_B} is a legitimate state and consequently $\text{tr}(\rho^{T_B} V) \leq 1$, we thus conclude

$$\langle \text{MES}|\rho|\text{MES}\rangle \leq \frac{1}{N}. \quad (10)$$

This completes the proof of the criterion, which is indeed a multi-particle generalization of the bipartite conclusion in Ref. [2].

This MES criterion is very useful when m is large, e.g. in the case of massive entanglement of Bose condensed atoms [17, 18]. Now consider the simple example of an arbitrary pure state of a N-state m-particle system, $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i_1,i_2\cdots,i_m} a_{i_1,i_2\cdots,i_m}|i_1 i_2\cdots i_m\rangle$, we can immediately state that it is m-particle entangled if $|\sum_i a_{i,i\cdots,i}| > 1$.

As an example, we consider the two qubit state

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= p|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + (1-p)|\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|, \\ |\psi_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle - |11\rangle), \\ |\psi_2\rangle &= |00\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

as considered by Horodeckis [4], where $0 \leq p \leq 1$. Making use of the fact that $\langle\Psi^-|\rho|\Psi^-\rangle = (1+p)/2$ and $|\Psi^-\rangle = (|00\rangle - |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, we immediately find that ρ is entangled for any $p \neq 0$, in agreement with the result of Ref. [4].

It is also straightforward to show that the MES criterion gives the upper bound for entanglement as found in NMR based systems [19]. Let's consider the bi-particle state of spin-$(N-1)/2$ particles

$$\rho = (1-\epsilon)\frac{I}{N^2} + \epsilon|\text{MES}\rangle\langle\text{MES}|, \tag{12}$$

with I the identity operator. Since $\langle\text{MES}|I|\text{MES}\rangle = 1$, we find the state of ρ is NPT entangled if

$$\langle\text{MES}|\rho|\text{MES}\rangle = \frac{(1-\epsilon)}{N^2} + \epsilon > \frac{1}{N}, \tag{13}$$

i.e. $\epsilon > 1/(N+1)$ [19]. According to arguments as given Ref. [19], this is also true for systems with $m > 2$ particles. It thus gives the same upper bound for entanglement of NMR based systems.

It is not difficult to show that our criterion can be generalized to the case when each different particle may have diffident number of states $\{N_j\}_{j=1}^m$. All it takes is to replace the N by $\min(N_1, N_2 \cdots, N_m)$, for the definition of MES in such a case.

We now consider the converse of our criterion. To answer this question, we first focus on the case of pure quantum states. It is also noticed that for pure states, any entangled state is NPT. For a 2-particle pure state system, the answer is an affirmative yes because of the following corollary.

Corollary 1 An arbitrary N-state 2-particle pure state $|\psi\rangle$ is entangled if and only if there exists a MES, such that $|\langle\text{MES}|\psi\rangle|^2 > 1/N$.

Proof: The "if" part comes from our MES criterion. The "only if" part is proved using the well known result that any bi-particle pure state can be written in the form of a Schmidt decomposition [20]

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} k_i|ii\rangle, \tag{14}$$

with $k_i > 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n k_i^2 = 1$. n $(1 \le n \le N)$ is the Schmidt number of state $|\psi\rangle$, which is entangled iff $n > 1$. Now take $|\text{MES}\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N |ii\rangle/\sqrt{N}$, for an entangled state $|\psi\rangle$ ($n > 1$ and $k_i > 0$)

$$|\langle\text{MES}|\psi\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{N}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_i\right)^2 > \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_i^2 = \frac{1}{N}, \tag{15}$$

which completes our proof.

From this corollary we have the following corollary immediately.

Corollary 2 For any pure state $|\psi\rangle$ of a N-state 2-particle system, if there exists a MES, such that $|\langle\text{MES}|\psi\rangle|^2 > p/N$, where p is a natural number, then its Schmidt number n must satisfy $n > p$.

For 3-particle systems, the following corollary 3 applies.

Corollary 3 If an arbitrary N-state 3-particle pure state $|\psi\rangle$ is not 3-particle entangled, then there exists a MES, such that $|\langle\text{MES}|\psi\rangle|^2 = 1/N$.

Proof: We directly construct a MES to satisfy $|\langle\text{MES}|\psi\rangle|^2 = 1/N$. If $|\psi\rangle$ is not 3-particle entangled, it has only two possible types of separability. Either it can be written as $|111\rangle$ in some particular basis, where apparently $|\text{MES}\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N |iii\rangle/\sqrt{N}$ will meet our requirement; or one of the particles is entangled with a second particle, but the two entangled ones are not entangled with the third particle. Take $|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle_1 \otimes |\psi\rangle_{23}$, for example, where 1 and 23 stand for particle indices 1, 2, and 3. Considering the condition of Eq. (2), we first write particle 2 and 3 in their Schmidt basis and then construct the basis where the state of particle 1 can be expressed as $\sum_{i=1}^N k_i|i\rangle$, where $k_i \ge 0$ are the Schmidt coefficients of state $|\psi\rangle_{23}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^N k_i^2 = 1$. Thus $|\psi\rangle$ can be rewritten as

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{N} k_i|i\rangle \otimes \sum_{i=1}^{N} k_i|ii\rangle. \tag{16}$$

It is then easy to check that $|\text{MES}\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N |iii\rangle/\sqrt{N}$ again fulfills the requirement.

Because Schmidt decomposition generally does not apply to three particle states, it is difficult to know whether the converse proposition of our MES criterion is true for $m = 3$. Even in situations where the generalized Schmidt decomposition applies [21, 22], we have failed to prove the validity of the converse analytically, although our numerical results indicate it to be always true. This can perhaps be understood since three-particle entanglement is essentially different from that of two parties.

For four-qubit systems, we find that even the counterpart of Corollary 3 does not exist. Take the state $|\psi\rangle = |11\rangle \otimes (|11\rangle + |22\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, for example, it is easy to show that this state can never satisfy the condition of Eq. (2) in any basis, i.e. $|\langle\text{MES}|\psi\rangle|^2 = 1/2$ can not be achieved. Our numerical results give $\max(|\langle\text{MES}|\psi\rangle|^2) = 1/4$, where the maximization is over all MES. Interestingly, our numerical simulations also show that Corollary 1 no longer holds for 4-particle systems. For example, the 4-particle W state $(|0001\rangle + |0010\rangle + |0100\rangle + |1000\rangle)/2$ [23] can only have a maximal projection onto MES of 0.347. This result illustrates the essential difference between the four-particle entanglement and that of three parties.

These results and examples thus constitute a negative answer to the converse proposition of our MES criterion.

For mixed states, our numerical results show that the converse of the MES sufficiency criterion fails even for two qubit systems. Take the following state,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= p|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + (1-p)|\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|, \\ |\psi_1\rangle &= a|00\rangle + b|11\rangle, \\ |\psi_2\rangle &= a|01\rangle + b|10\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

with $a, b > 0$ and $a^2 + b^2 = 1$, for example, as considered by Horodeckis in Ref. [4]. It is known to be entangled if and only if $ab \ne 0$ and $p \ne 1/2$. We find

numerically, however, that for many entangled states of this type, $\max(\langle \mathrm{MES}|\rho|\mathrm{MES}\rangle) < 1/2$. For instance, when $a = 0.6$, $b = 0.8$, and $p = 0.495$, state ρ of Eq. (17) is entangled, yet it is easy to check that $\max(\langle \mathrm{MES}|\rho|\mathrm{MES}\rangle) = 0.4949 < 1/2$.

In summary, we have proposed and proved a criterion, a sufficient condition for testing multi-particle NPT entanglement, based on the maximal overlap of a given quantum state with MES. We have shown that for bi-particle pure state systems, this criterion is also a necessary condition. In general, however, the converse proposition of our criterion is not true, i.e. this MES criterion is not a necessary condition for multi-particle NPT entanglement. We believe our result will shed new light on the studies of multi-particle entanglement, and it is especially useful in practical problems where the particle number m is large. We also hope that our result will help further investigations of multi-particle quantum state distillation.

We thank Mr. J. G. Xiang, Prof. X. F. Liu, and Prof. C. P. Sun for helpful discussions. The work of D. L. Zhou is partially supported by the National Science Foundation of China (CNSF) grant No. 10205022. P. Zhang is supported by CNSF, the Knowledged Innovation Program (KIP) of the Chinese Academy of Science, and the National Fundamental Research Program of China (No. 001GB309310). L. You acknowledges support from NSF and CNSF(B). The work of Z. Xu is partially supported by the CNSF grant No. 90103004 and 10247002.

[1] M. A. Nilsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000).
[2] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, in *Quantum Information: An Introduction to Basic Theoretical Concepts and Experiments*, edited by G. Alber, T. Beth, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, M. Rotteler, H. Weinfurter, R. Werner, and A. Zeilinger, published in *Springer Tracts in Modern Physics*, July (2001).
[3] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413 (1996).
[4] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).
[5] P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **232**, 333 (1997).
[6] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 5385 (1999).
[7] L. M. Duan, G. Giedke, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2722 (2000).
[8] R. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2726 (2000).
[9] M. Lewenstein, D. Bruss, J. I. Cirac, B. Kraus, M. Kus, J. Samsonowicz, A. Sanpera, and R. Tarrach, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 2841 (2000).
[10] D. M. Greenberger, M. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, in *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory, and Conception of the Universe*, (Kluewer Academic, Dordrecht, 1989).
[11] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).
[12] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 722 (1996).
[13] M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4206 (1999).
[14] C.A. Sackett, D. Kielpinski, B.E. King, C. Langer, V. Meyer, C.J. Myatt, M. Rowe, Q.A. Turchette, W.M. Itano, D.J. Wineland, and C. Monroe, Nature (London) **404**, 256 (2000).
[15] M. Seevinck and J. Uffink, Phys. Rev. **A65**, 012107 (2002); J. Uffink, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 230406 (2002).
[16] Xiaoguang Wang, Mang Feng, and Barry C Sanders, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 022302 (2003).
[17] K. Helmerson and L. You, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 170402 (2001).
[18] A. Sørensen, L. M. Duan, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Nature (London) **409**, 63 (2001).
[19] S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves, R. Jozsa, N. Linden, S. Popescu, and R. Schack, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1054 (1999).
[20] F. Riesz and B. SzNagy, *Functional Analysis*, (Ungar, New York, 1955).
[21] H. Carteret, A. Higuchi, and Sudbery, J. Math. Phys. **41**, 7932 (2000).
[22] A. Acín, A. Andrianov, L. Costa, E. Jane, J. I. Latorre, and R. Tarrach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1560 (2000).
[23] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 062314 (2000)